

***Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary***

Date: January 26, 2006

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson
Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner
Stephen Petersen, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director of Building and Planning; Brooke Zurek, Planner.

Call to Order

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: John Julian III, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chair, present; Karen Plummer, present; Marty O'Donnell, present; Stephen Petersen, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Julian announced the order of proceedings.

Old Business

ARC 05-26 Gaffrig Residence, 225 Coolidge Avenue (Historic)
Petitioner: Thomas Reed, Reed Architects

Mr. Julian swore in those present who wished to speak.

A preliminary meeting was held on October 27, 2005 and the petitioner decided to move forward to a public hearing at this time.

The petitioner plans to add a second story addition to the rear of the existing one story structure.

Mr. Reed gave an overview of the planned renovations. The proposed plans are as follows:

1. Removal of existing aluminum siding.
2. Replacement of siding with "Hardi Board" cementitious lap siding with a 2-¾ inch exposure.
3. Replacement of windows with Marvin double hung wood windows.
4. Installation of half round gutters.
5. Installation of brick on the chimney to match the existing brick.
6. Restoration of damaged water table.
7. Restoration of any stucco at the front gable.

Mr. Reed displayed samples of materials to be used. The materials displayed were as follows:

1. Brick: To match existing.

2. Shingles: Three tab asphalt in black.
3. Window: Wood Marvin window with 5/8" insulated glass and divided lights.
4. Window Frame: Wood to be used with flat casing.

Mr. Reed explained they plan to install two replacement windows on either side of the fireplace chimney as well as two smaller windows on the west side of the home to replace the larger picture window that is currently there.

In addition, they propose to remove the pergola from the backyard and remove the deck from the master bedroom. They plan to replace the master bedroom deck with a railing and also add a wood railing to the front porch.

Mr. Julian asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. There were no public comments.

Mr. Wallace presented the staff report.

Mr. Julian asked the commission for any comments.

Ms. Troy stated that she is concerned with the size of the rear addition and the front elevation due to the size of the roof, but added she thinks it is attractively detailed.

Mr. Coath stated that the house seems to be set up for "K" style gutters and would like to know how they plan to install half-round gutters.

Mr. Reed explained that they would use gutter straps hung off the roof sheathing. He added it will look much better with half-round gutters.

Mr. Coath also addressed a question about the window casing. The plans show the flat board trim to be a 3-1/4 inch dimension and Mr. Coath asked if that was something Marvin would do or if would be done in the field.

Mr. Reed explained that it would be applied in the field.

Mr. Coath added that he felt the 3-1/4 inch trim is rather thin, and typically a 4 inch dimension is used. He recommended using a 4 inch instead.

Mr. Coath asked Mr. Reed why they decided on Hardi Board (cementitious) opposed to cedar siding.

Mr. Reed explained that his clients wanted a low maintenance material and decided on Hardi Board.

Mr. Coath stated that the longevity and repainting cycle of cementitious siding is not yet known and Mr. Reed agreed.

Mr. Petersen asked Mr. Reed if they plan to restore the posts on the front porch and asked about the slab that the porch sits on.

Mr. Reed stated he believed that the slab is original to the home.

Mr. Petersen asked if they plan on changing the front porch posts in any way.

Mr. Reed indicated they did not plan to make any changes to them.

Mr. Petersen addressed the shed roof on the east elevation of the house. He stated he feels the shed roof should be extended so there is a rake overhang on it. It would then match the west side.

Mr. Petersen addressed the chimney cap they plan to use. He would like to see something more simple used because it is more appropriate for this house and would reflect more Craftsman detail.

Mr. Reed agreed that he too had noticed that and though he doesn't like a simple chimney cap one is appropriate in this case.

Ms. Plummer stated her only concern is the elevation from the street.

Ms. Troy asked if Hardi Board siding will be used on the existing house.

Mr. Reed said that is the plan unless they find the existing siding to be in good condition under the aluminum siding.

Mr. Julian addressed the massing and the scale of the proposed renovation. The consensus is that the commission finds the massing and scale to be acceptable.

Mr. Julian addressed the differentiation between old and new. It was a consensus that the siding should be saved if it is possible and that there is a differentiation between old and new.

Mr. Julian asked the commission if the site is a contributing structure. All agreed it is contributing.

Mr. Julian asked the commission if they would agree to adopt staff's findings. All agreed that they would adopt staff's findings.

Mr. Wallace read the following conditions that were noted in the discussion:

1. Four-inch casings will be used on the sides of the windows.
2. The rake overhang on the shed will remain.
3. The chimney cap to be used will be simplified to reflect Craftsman detailing.
4. The scale and massing is acceptable.
5. The differentiation between old and new meets the standard.
6. Recommend siding be saved up to the rear edge of the first gable on the east elevation.
7. Half-round gutters will be used.

Mr. Wallace asked if the commission would like to require a staff inspection.

Mr. Julian replied they will not require an inspection.

Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve a certificate of approval with the conditions noted. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.

Aye: Julian, Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy, Petersen. Nay: None. Motion carried.

New Business

ARC 06-02 Stratford Townhomes, 1412 South Barrington Road (Non Historic)

Petitioner: David Thoma, Stratford Development Co., Inc.

This is a preliminary review for a proposed a townhome development.

Mr. Julian recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Thoma presented an overview of the proposed project. The town home development is for three buildings to include a total of seven town homes. Mr. Thoma displayed the map of the property showing

the front of the units, landscaping, lighting, common area with an arbor, as well as the proposed siding and stone.

Mr. Wallace presented the staff report.

In the staff report Mr. Wallace noted the following points staff recommends for discussion:

1. Relationship of buildings and site to the adjoining area
2. Exterior lighting
3. Harmony and compatibility of materials with adjacent buildings
4. Window proportions
5. Mechanical equipment location
6. Refuse area location
7. Whether or not the design avoids monotony
8. Lighting of the public space

Ms. Plummer noted that the style is different from most in the village.

Mr. Thoma explained that they had debated whether to go more urban or more country. They wanted to create a design that would take away the impact of having the garages in the front. They created a casual but elegant design by using a lot of trim details.

Ms. Plummer asked if they have shown the design to any neighbors.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the neighbors to the west expressed concern about the massing.

Ms. Plummer discussed the monotony of the design.

Mr. Petersen noted that he would like to see a little variation in the design, possibly with the roof massing. He would like a more traditional look.

Mr. Coath stated he would like to see some subtle changes. He suggested something with the window configuration or detail.

Mr. Coath suggested using a second story frieze board because it looks like it is missing something. He added he would like to see more Queen Anne and Classical details.

Mr. Coath discussed the windows. He asked if the window divisions were stylized. He stated it would be better to use a window pattern that is more recognizable.

Ms. Troy stated that she doesn't think the style is too monotonous due to the fact it is only seven units. She suggested using a different muntin pattern on the bay window than on the other windows.

Ms. Troy addressed the issue of the community refuse location.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the residents would be responsible for storing their refuse in the garage.

Mr. O'Donnell indicated he did not think that the monotony is an issue but he would like to see some variations in the windows.

Ms. Plummer agreed that the windows could be changed so there is a slight difference between the units.

Mr. Wallace went over the points stated during discussion:

1. The monotony issue is generally acceptable, but some variations in roof massing and window configuration should be explored to reduce monotony.

2. The muntin patterns seem awkward.
3. A frieze board on the 2nd story should be considered.
4. There is a good transition between adjacent uses.
5. The dog ears at the bottom of the gable rakes seem awkward.
6. Ceiling mounted porch lights are acceptable.
7. Materials and style are acceptable.

New Business

ARC 06-03 Starr Couture, 325 East Main Street

Petitioner: Paul Psenka, Psenka Architects; Starr Kondos, owner.

The petitioner seeks a Certificate of Approval to construct an enclosed porch addition on the north side of the existing building that will serve as a display window and to alter the exterior entrance on the west of the existing building.

Mr. Psenka presented the proposed plan. He stated the style will mainly be Folk Victorian. They plan to enclose the front porch to create a store front display, add an entrance on the west side of the building, and remove the lattice below the front porch.

Mr. Wallace presented the staff report. He stated that staff believes that the petition meets the design standards and recommends approval. One question to address would be for the signage.

Ms. Kondos (owner) addressed the commission regarding the sign she would like displayed. She requested suggestions or ideas from the commission.

Mr. Julian suggested using a monument sign. He said you could angle the sign on the corner of Spring and Main Streets so that it could be viewed from different directions.

Mr. Wallace indicated a monument sign would be permitted, but only if the sign that is currently on the property is removed. Having two ground signs on one property is prohibited.

Mr. Julian suggested using the biggest monument sign that the ordinance allows.

Ms. Kondos was concerned the sign would not be viewable from different directions.

Mr. Julian suggested using an ell-shaped sign.

Ms. Kondos asked for guidance in designing the sign.

Mr. Wallace suggested contacting staff separately from this meeting to discuss that issue.

Mr. Julian asked for any comments on the proposed modifications to the building.

Mr. O'Donnell stated the side entrance is dramatically better than it was in the concept drawings they had seen earlier. He feels the front is a compromise and it looks like a porch.

Mr. Julian agreed though he would prefer to see it broken up somehow. He suggested possibly using a pilaster.

Mr. Coath stated that he agrees that the glass is too large and appears out of scale.

Ms. Kondos expressed her concern with breaking up the window. She stated a large expanse of glass is needed for her displays.

The commission discussed different ways to use the front porch as a display and how big the expanse of glass could be. The commission could not come to a consensus on whether or not to allow the full twelve-foot-wide glass or whether to require it to be divided in some way. The commission decided to have the board of trustees make the final decision regarding the glass on the front porch.

Mr. Petersen addressed concerns about moving the shed roof and adding a large gable above the side door. He stated the door gets lost under the canopy.

Mr. Psenka stated he could make the door a little wider than it currently is.

Mr. Petersen suggested using paneling instead of sidelights next to the door to make it appear larger.

Mr. Coath stated his concern with increasing the scale of the door.

Mr. Julian stated that this is a secondary entrance and he likes it the way it is now.

Mr. Wallace reviewed the discussion and noted the following conditions:

1. The new display windows shall be clear, non-tinted glass.
2. Vertical boards, which may be solid behind their façade, shall be used for the skirting between the piers under the front addition. The piers shall be expressed as variations in the plane of the skirting.
3. A lintel element similar to that used at the new front gable element shall be added to the new side gable element.
4. Victorian-style light fixtures shall be used at the side entrance.
5. The brick bases supporting the west pilasters shall be more substantial.
6. Alterations shall be made to reduce the impact of the large expanse of glass in the front addition. Pilasters or posts of the same design as those existing on the house shall be utilized to do so. The pilasters or posts shall be installed on each side of the new front door and at the left front and rear corners of the addition. The ARC recommends that the Village board decide whether or not the twelve-foot-wide glass be divided with a pilaster.
7. Details of the changes shall be brought back to the ARC for approval.

Mr. O'Donnell made a motion to recommend approval of a certificate of approval for the proposed renovations with conditions noted. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Aye: Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy, Petersen. Nay: Julian. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes

Meeting minutes for November 17, 2005 were reviewed. No changes were noted.

Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve the minutes from November 17, 2005. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Aye: Julian, Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy, Petersen. Nay: None. Motion carried.

Meeting Minutes from December 1, 2005 were reviewed. No changes were noted.

Mr. Petersen made a motion to approve the minutes from December 1, 2005. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Aye: Julian, Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy, Petersen. Nay: None. Motion carried.

Meeting Minutes from December 15, 2005 were reviewed. Mr. Julian, Ms. Troy, and Ms. Plummer noted changes to be made to the minutes.

Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve the minutes from December 15, 2005 with changes noted. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.

Aye: Julian, Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy, Petersen. Nay: None. Motion carried.

Meeting Minutes from January 12, 2006 were reviewed. No changes were noted.

Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve the minutes from January 12, 2006. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Aye: Julian, Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy, Petersen. Nay: None. Motion carried

Planner's Report

Mr. Wallace presented the Planner's Report.

Mr. Wallace posed a question to the ARC regarding moving of a historical garage within the historical district.

Mr. Wallace also asked the ARC under what circumstances cementitious siding would be approved.

Ms. Troy stated that it was allowed on additions only.

After discussion it was the consensus that cementitious siding generally could not be used on the front of houses or on any prominent elevation.

Mr. Wallace gave an update on the historical design guidelines. He stated that all of ARC's comments were included except for the section on new construction and vacant sites, which would require further discussion. The Board is due to have a formal hearing soon to adopt the guidelines.

Adjournment

Ms. Troy moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion. Voice note recorded all Ayes. The motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon Conroy
Recording Secretary

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission